

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Fine Arts Faculty Council

FAFC

Friday, December 7, 1984

Present:

R. Parker, Chair; M. Notarangelo, Liaison Office; J. Byers; J. Belisle; L. Gilbert; E. Cooke; K. Adams; A. Adams; P. Lesick; J. Miller; E. Langley; W. Krol; A. Herman; G. Gross; D. Austin; A. Homzy; B. Queenan, AV Department observer; A. Stonyer; D. Dorrance; G. Szilasi; C. MacKenzie; S. Thornton; L. Sherman; J. Gordon; M.A. Robitaille; E. Sacca; A. Brooymans; S. McLeod; J. Locke; J. Fox; T. Gibson; M. Falsetto; F. Pelletier; J. Kelly; I. Sendek.

1. Approval of the Minutes

*Motion

(Belisle, Gross) "that Council approve the minutes of the meeting of November 2nd, 1984"

CARRIED

2. Chair Remarks

As background information, to the budget cut exercise, the Budget Cut Task Force will be composed of the faculty members, a Dean, a student and a staff representative. It is to investigate ways to trim the budget over the next twelve month period and it is to be directed at both the administrative and academic departments. However, it is also the aim of the Task Force to maintain quality within the University, itself, unlike the last budget cut that we went through which was about two years ago, when we saw a general lessening of services within the University.

In 1979-80, Fine Arts had a total student population of 2000. In 1979-80, a total population of 2300 and in 1980-81, we had a total population of 2500, in 1981-82 - about 2600. 1981-82 was the year of the first University budget cut. If you look back on preceding years you will notice that there has been an increase of about 600 students. However, our budget, in the year of the budget cut, was lower than our 1979 allocation. Obviously my concern is co-operation but at the same time also the quality and welfare of the Faculty itself. For your information, I have invited the Chairs along with a representative from each Department to attend an all-day workshop or seminar at the local hotel here, to address some of the concerns that I have, and to begin

to speak to one another in regard to some of the goals, directions, aspirations that we may have as a group and as a Faculty regarding the education of individuals in the Arts. We will be meeting on Tuesday, December 11th and hopefully some of the ideas and notions that we have been discussing and perhaps even recommendations will come out of that meeting.

* Motion

(Austin, Sherman) "That there be no smoking at the Fine Arts Council meetings."

CARRIED

3. Curriculum Report, no.3 - Graduate Proposals

It is in great detail so it is good that you have had sufficient opportunity to look through the report for its general conclusions and details. Two programs in this curriculum proposal are contemplating changes, the Masters in Arts in Art History is the more substantial in the group of changes in as much as they want to reduce the credit value of their program from 60 to 45 to bring them in line with the majority of Masters programs in the University and outside and also to prevent it from being treated, both on the part of students and supervising Faculty, as something of a terminal degree. Students in Art History may have been taking a very long time to get through the program, so the attempt is to hopefully get the students through more quickly but to also provide a more systematic exposure to the History of Art and its Canadian content. Therefore, the Dept. has not only asked for a reduction in the total credit value but also to institute a series of courses which all students would be required to take. The majority of these will be taken in the first year, with two courses, related to research and thesis topic, to be taken in the second year.

With respect to cost, there might be an administrative cost involved in the third significant change to that program, and that is the institution of a language requirement within the program. Students entering second year standing will be asked to pass a reading comprehension exam, both in French and English, no matter what their first language is. These exams are being prepared by the Department in conjunction with the relevant language Departments. This will allow us to test pupils in the two principal languages of Canadian Art History and, as a by-product, will be discerned with language problems that the students may have in their own language.

The Department of Art Education and Art Therapy is changing its program in a rather significant fashion. It is instituting a new course which will be added to its existing core requirements. This is not an unusual feature of many Doctorate programs. What it does is in essence give and therefore also place a kind of

context around the courses leading to the comprehensive exams. Moreover, Art Education in the Doctorate program is changing the title to reflect what has been going on in those courses in the last two or three years. It was determined that it would make more sense to have existing courses actually physically deleted and add new courses instead.

Council wants to know in greater detail how the components of the Art Education Doctorate are being distributed. I would be more than willing to meet after Council with a table that Dr. Brooks drew up regarding this. Any questions in terms of the report as it stands?

*Motion

(MacKenzie, Gross) "that this report, with the notation that there is one typographical error on page 6 identifying program four for Art History should be the final component 655 rather than 635."

Looking at the language requirement in Art History, I sense some slight conflict in the way the rationale is stated and the requirements. The rationale states that you are going to ensure that students possess the reading skills requisite for successful graduate work. Since those students only take their exam at the end of the first year, they may already have proved that they can be successful in graduate work at the time that they fail the exam.

I can understand your point.

I understand why you are doing it, but it is uncomfortable to have to do that, and to do that in a Graduate program.

Any Graduate programs that I've had anything to do with have considered this to be necessary. The Art History Department felt that they wanted tests in both languages. There is always the situation of having a graduate student's first language as a third language, and so you are testing the two that are required for the program. There are also real possibilities that these are students who do have competence in operating in their first language.

May I suggest that if that is discovered at the end of the first year, then you try to do something about it.

It is not directed at grammatical quirks in the student's writing, it is directed to their capacity to read, and that is the essential issue.

I'm coming back to why you can't make language an admission requirement. It is reading knowledge of English and French, not speaking that you are asking for. I haven't checked but there might be other programs in the University that have a language requirement on admission. Have you checked?

There is a problem. It is very hard to do it before if we are doing this kind of exam. At the moment I am obliged to do a lot of translation because people are unable to do French. When we send the form, we are saying that people need to speak English and French, however at the moment there is no way we can check that before. As Catherine mentioned, people are coming from Winnipeg. It is physically impossible.

Going along the lines of what we are discussing now, if a person comes in without the capacity to read French or even read English, are they going to be able to get that capacity within one year? What happens if they cannot?

If they cannot read, it's too bad. They will be thrown out of the program otherwise what is the value of the degree? You have to be very strict on that.

I understand that, but the question in a practical sense is if you do not have it as an admission requirement, and a student is admitted to the program without the ability to read French or English, they must have opportunities to study the other language that year in order to pass the exam.

What a requirement like this also does is make very clear to people reading the Calendar entry that we do expect a reading knowledge of English and French and that they will learn prior even to arriving in September that they will take a summer off or whatever to prepare for this test. It reflects the reality of the nature of this program that we do need the two languages.

Is there any provision for retaking an exam or is there some description of what happens if they fail the exam? Are they permitted to take it again, or does failing mean they are automatically out of the program? Is this written anywhere?

They would be given the opportunity, those kinds of policies are generally not in the Calendar.

We will try to encourage the student to take a course to be able to function. However, obviously if the student cannot function well we will try to discourage the student. Even if it is perhaps tough, that is the rule of the game, we have to maintain a standard.

I understand why you want to put it in, but as I look at it, it seems to be something in the end that is un-enforcible. You have stated that the student would be unable to write the papers, but the issue is reading knowledge. It seems to me that any student that you deny admission to in second year standing, save the cause of a failure of an English reading test, if that student went to the Ombudsman, the Dean and/or the Court of Law and shows that he or she has successfully passed courses required in reading in that language then you must overturn your own decision.

Is there not a parallel between this kind of reading test and the one that has been instituted on the Undergraduate level, where you can pass all your courses and still be denied graduation because you have not passed the University Writing Test? I don't think that there is anything to preclude that and again, I would prefer to see degree programs at the Graduate level in fact do precisely that. The students are kept around sometimes for lengthy periods to hold their reading tests.

That is not true. It is in the language of the program, and the graduate situation is not parallel because the students have three years to take it: The students were not denied admission into the next years' course.

Regarding the Doctorate of Philosophy in Art Education, the staffing of this course will be best made by the Faculty assigned by the Chair. I'm assuming that is the cost value, is it not?

Well, the students will require an advisor but it's not counted in terms of credit value for the Faculty.

It is not counted as a course for the Faculty.

The students are assigned an advisor, but Faculty doesn't get credit.

I just want to clarify that. Will a Faculty member (individual), be assigned this course? If so, it is a cost item.

No one faculty member will be assigned this course, it will be distributed throughout the Faculty.

...Full-time students enrolling in the programs, and part-time students coming into this program can take it in three stages over a period of time. At the same time if a full-time student plans to take a full complement of courses, over a two-year period there will be courses available and the opportunity for them to take all these courses.

It would have been beneficial, had we been able to see the course descriptions for the new courses, and I think for Faculty Council as well. I know that this is not normally done, but I think this is beneficial information, so that Council can get an idea what content is being presented within the courses...

Regarding the Art History program, Master of Art and Art History it says that nine credits in History may be elected, I assume that that is throughout the entire University as well as the Faculty of Fine Arts.

In terms of what courses you are offering, or that are being proposed to offer, first year, you have a core requirement as well as elective; second year you also have 634 and 635. In the sense that there is no cost there is really no change in how the

actual program is to be structured.

We have a number of courses listed here - far more than was previously presented. Is it going to be possible with the staff in Art History and the demands of the students coming in perhaps on a full-time basis to offer these courses and not necessarily increase the cost of them?

I believe for the upcoming year, they have referred to an extra 3-credit course, staffed by full or part-time faculty.

Does the department envision that this will constantly increase over a period of time, or is it going to be relatively stabilized at a certain point?

There will be no increase. The number of credits we offer each year will be the same as it is now.

So I assume that the department has, in the process of defining its curriculum, looked at long-term course offerings and how they will be structured over a period of time so that the student indeed gets all the benefits of the specialization and certainly meets all the needs of the students and at the same time, doesn't escalate the number of courses to be offered.

The admission procedure will be the same, to draw the same number of students. It has not been the aim to increase the total number of students.

With regard to Art History 639, Seminar in Canadian Decorative Arts. One of the functions of this discussion, I understand to be is to provide an opportunity to look at the fall-out from graduate changes on the undergraduate programs. In the past, the Art History Department has requested that selected students be allowed to take a History of Decorative Arts on the undergraduate level and the Art History Department has not been able to accede to that request. Only occasionally is the course given on the undergraduate level and hence we cannot guarantee that students in our program that need the course will be able to take it. What I want to know is whether or not there is any relation between that particular request and the inclusion of the course at the graduate level a repeatable course? Will, for example, the opportunity of more students in the Faculty still be occasional to take a History of the Decorative Arts or will it be frequent, or, will there be no change, in which case it remains as occasional. Is there any fallout?

From our point of view, we have this in every year for the simple reason that we want to cover every possibility for the future. It by no means assures that this will be offered each year. There will be no change at the undergraduate level if we want the situation to remain the same. This is a separate program.

I wondered if there was any thought to the provision of double numbers in some cases. Undergraduate and Graduate courses

having double numbers so that upon occasion some economies might be made in that manner.

Wethought of that also. The general feeling of the dept. (the people that are involved in it), to add a double number... Most of the Faculty were against that process for several reasons. One is that the level of the course is different. The classroom situation will never be exactly as it would be at a Graduate level because the level of the students is very different. It will penalize both the graduate student and the undergraduate student.

Do you ever get a Graduate student coming in who is quite sophisticated in certain areas of specialization but doesn't have the knowledge of graduate work in other areas. Wouldn't they be quite comfortable doing an undergraduate course in that area of specialization?

*Motion

The question was called and CARRIED

4. Student Request Committee Report

These two reports are presented for information and do not require any action. These reports have been prepared by France Pelletier and the Office of Student Affairs and give the breakdown of the kind of student requests by department, etc. There are some observations on the last few pages. There seem to be a lot of student requests. I don't know what else to say about this report. It may be ok that we have a lot of student requests, however, it is probably a situation that will be discussed further by the Chairs of various departments and by Administration.

I have some questions, but I also have some comments to make. For instance, 22% of our student population filled a student request during this last semester. The other thing that I would like to draw your attention to, and certainly France can provide enhancement to anything I'm saying, is that I think it is important that Departments begin to look at the total number and the pattern of their student requests.

I think there are some issues at hand that need to be addressed. I don't think they need to be addressed right now, but by virtue of the types and the number of requests that are submitted, certain categories should be looked at and some questions asked. If you have students asking for a great number of substitutions within a program, that might be a good matter to look into. If you have a great number of students that are requesting a late completion supplementary exam that might be a question you might need to address within you department. Department Chairs should begin to look at the categories and

frequency of student requests within their departments, there are issues there that need to be addressed.

On the last page, if you look at the general breakdown of program by program of study, there are some issues that can be addressed here, by their frequency and rationale. The frequency of requests is up (within various departments). Page six outlines something that would behoove the Chairperson to begin to look at and that is the process of student requests and the types of ramifications that have been made. I went through this process for two years in the Graduate Student Request and I certainly can back this statement up. Another question I have, which is on page five, maybe France can answer this, is the change in 1983-84 -509 student requests as opposed to 366 submitted in 1982-83.

Generally, I think a large part of the increase is due to curriculum changes. Another reason perhaps why students must have come in is the bulge of students we seem to have in second and third year (due to their large admissions two years ago)...Departments and Department Chairs perhaps could have been more aggressive on the student requests and possibly see all student records and advise them to go through the student request channel before it became a graduation problem.

In the past, as well, the Departments would often make internal changes in classrooms etc. and we would have problems in the end with grades and so on. If there is any change in terms of course change the Departments are more open about it.

I find the report very useful, and I would like to thank the Committee for making the report.

In terms of the Registration Committee Report, the Committee has been meeting for the last couple of months quite regularly. It was made up of D. Dorrance, D. Andrus, L. Adams, myself, and F. Pelletier. We tried to be as responsive as possible to all the feedback we received and solicited from all sectors of the Faculty, staff, students and administrative persons. The report is divided into two sections one is simply an analysis of the statistics on two registrations. You will notice some healthy increases in pre-registrations. The information seems to be getting around that people should pre-register if they want to make sure they get courses they want in the Fall. The other section of the report contains general statements, some philosophical, about the pre-registration process. We begin with some basic assumptions:

1. That the entire registration process is very crucial in the life of the student.
2. That the time-table, course selection and advising are all very serious.
3. That all Faculty members will advise the students.
4. That all Faculty members will know their programs.

We hope that these are not false assumptions. We really believe that all students, part-time and full-time deserve excellent advising and a streamlined kind of process through the pre-

registration and registration maze. We hope that Departments and Department Chairs are planning their timetables well. I think that we have learned a lot from this 1984 registration process. It was an improvement over 1983, and we are proposing some recommendations for 1985 which I believe will improve the process even more. We do not intend to overhaul the system every year, rather, we hope to get to the point where it will only require minor adjustments. Once the system is learned it will not have to be relearned each year. Obviously, it is a process which will take a couple of years. Some of the recommendations that we made are within our power, and some are not. We have already had preliminary discussions with Registrar's Services, they have been very receptive, and are willing to work with us. What we would like today is a discussion of this document and approval of the recommendations so that we can finish planning the whole process for this year and can start meeting with the Registrar's Services regarding our recommendations.

*Motion

(Falsetto, Miller) "acceptance of the Registrar's Committee Report, and approval of the recommendations that are contained in the report."

One of several recommendations that is included in this document and that is also present in a document that the Registrar's Office will present to the Registration Committee, is that summer registration be included as a part of pre-registration. There are things that are very positive such as the co-operation that has been going on between the departments. We still have to discuss some techniques... The Senate Registration Committee will be looking at this.

I have three points of concern to Art Education... As an instructor, it is distressing to me to have people coming in three weeks late into a course. On the other hand we are looking at it from the students' point of view. What is the purpose of the course change procedure? It seems to me that students have the opportunity to go to a course and discover that it is not for them and it gives them a chance to go to one class in every course. Is that right? It would seem to me that we would need to do a little bit of publicity to inform students before-hand that the course-change period is only five days. I'm not sure what form this information could take if it is implemented. It might be in the advising, in the pre-registration...

I think that pre-registration is the place for it. It might be in the information packet that we are going to send out in January about course options.

We have already talked about this. We know that the problem of students walking into the classroom three weeks late is a serious one, and as teachers we hate it but we cannot abolish the process of course change.

The next point has to do with advising at pre-registration. Art Education last year, instituted terrific advising sessions. It is educational for the Faculty. We can also make it a requirement that the Faculty be present at these information sessions. The problem last year was that the information packets for the students did not get out in time for our advising sessions. Now I intend to try to work that out with France and Shirley but seeing as how everything has moved ahead now, we may then have the same problem again.

No, in the previous years the hold-up was because of the inclusion of the timetable in the published pre-registration booklet with the package of information. This year, what we plan to include a temporary Fine Arts timetable and get out all the other relevant information early. When the official timetables become available around February, the students can come and pick it up, but they can start thinking about the process a lot earlier.

What I understand is that, aside from the information we put out separately, the pre-registration packages came from the Registrar's Office.

We are going to take that over.

A lot of these recommendations imply a certain amount of increase in the workload in the office of Student Affairs. This kind of centralization is a good way to go, and I'm sure that you will support that kind of increase of expenditure; we have asked for another Program Advisor as well.

One of the points about getting this information out early however, is getting this information in from the Faculty. Getting the timetable finalized and fixed without changes is the key.

Part of my responsibility is the timetable. We are trying to finalize things by January 15 and then get this temporary timetable published right away. We have been aware of the amount of the work load in the Departments because of admissions and pre-registration etc. and are trying to take this into consideration by slightly lengthening the process.

In terms of information, I would think that the Faculty as a whole could do perhaps more in the way of a co-ordinated attempt to inform students not only of the programs within each department, but perhaps also about taking courses in other departments, or the possibilities of switching majors. Just as we are planning an information session for CEGEP students about the offerings, maybe an intra-faculty...

I agree with you. Part of the information package will contain a Departmental Information Sheet. Each Department will make it up and it will contain things that the department wants to tell its own students about programs, courses, etc.

Hopefully, what the department would like to tell the Faculty and student in other departments would be included. I'm just thinking of trying to break down some of these walls that are beginning to build up so that students really do not know what is available within the Faculty and what flexibility actually exists within the various programs. There is a need for intra-Faculty information.

I would like to direct a question about a matter concerning course change. In the studio area where there are 39 studio teachers, there is always a steamy and potentially volatile chance for personality conflict happening way after course change. What does one do then?

First of all, there is the informal registration period which is something that the office can do. This lasts for a few weeks after the official one ends. Is that not however what Student Requests are for?

It is very clear that if there are problems, we have to solve them. You cannot let the regulations stand in the way of solving a problem.

Clarification on the contract situation. I believe Faculty are required to be available until convocation, and for one week before Labour Day. That is the information that came up about Faculty not being available for advising in the Fall. The registration problem is now solved.

... What about the problem concerning the possibility of abolishing in-person registration in Fine Arts?

There will always be a need for it I think. We propose that within the very near future, many of the problems of the in-person registration will become minimal because most of the registration will have been completed beforehand.

I assume that Council endorses these recommendation, but if something proves to be impossible, then we will just have to work out the best system possible.

*Motion

The question was called and CARRIED

5. Access To Programs by Part-time Students

This issue came up at the last Faculty Council, that is the concern of part-time study within the Faculty Of Fine Arts. I would direct you to the last page of your package... Before we open up the discussion to any question that you might have, I would like to give you some figures. Within the Faculty of Fine Arts there are (33) thirty-three Undergraduate programs and

eight (8) Graduate programs. The programs that are closed to part-time studies are: 3-D Design, Graduate Design, Major in Theatre Performance, Scenography Stream, Dance Major and the MFA Program.

Regarding our general Undergraduate population over the years, I can go back to 1974-75. I will give you this very quickly just so that you can get an idea how our part-time enrollment has changed over the years:

In 1974-75	there were	295	part-time students registered
1975-76	"	500	"
1976-77	"	627	"
1977-78	"	724	"
1978-79	"	869	"
1979-80	"	909	"
1980-81	"	1123	"
1981-82	"	1197	"
1982-83	"	1175	"
1983-84	"	1066	"
1984-85	"	982	"

You can see that we have indeed reached a peak, and we are now moving in a downward manner. There has been a change in reporting regarding the "independent" student. These students are no longer included in our figures. At one time both the full and part-time independent student figures were included. All "special" students are now classified as independent. This might be indicative of the slight drop in part-time enrollment figures.

The question that comes up frequently is the definition of part-time. Some people identify part-time as synonymous with evening students, complicating the statistics. That is part of the reason there is an increase. There was at one time a distinction that evening students were part-time and had to apply as full-time students to take day courses. Those students that were full-time day students, if they took courses in the evening, became evening students and could not go back into the day program unless they were re-admitted. Now whether you get the change from a definition of evening and day, or full-time and part-time, you have this freedom of people right across the board taking courses either part-time in the day or part-time in the evening, and there is a set of statistics where if you define a number of students who take courses who are classified as full-time students taking evening courses are in the 40% range or the other way around where you classify people who are part-time supposedly start as evening students who end up taking courses in the day the statistics are a little over 50%. So this shows where the statistics increase. It is not an increase in the number of people in the evening, rather an increase in the course load that a person is taking. I think in the definition, in the question I am going to bring up - what is your interpretation of part-time students in light of this document? I feel that you are talking about evening students. If you don't schedule courses in the evening they are not in the program.

It is a question that we need to address, but I think moving

away from some of the administrative and philosophical questions about part-time students, we might want to put that question on hold, and perhaps have the discussion on it after we begin the discussion as per the document that has been presented to us.

The question that the Permanent Review Committee addressed to Faculty Council for discussion, concerning the accessibility of part-time students to programs offered in the Faculty of Fine Arts, is a Women's Issues... That is the first question that has to be addressed. Is the Faculty moving away from part-time focus?

It is necessary to define part-time.

...Less than 24 credits.

I would like to hear from other departments as to why they do not have part-time students. I know why we decided to eliminate part-time students and would be willing to explain why not.

Because we have been grouped together as a kind of anti-something group, I would like to hear from other people, so I won't feel so alone.

First, you accept or not the premise that part-time students issues are women's issues.

I have here enrolment statistics that were published in the Thursday Report last week which said that of the new part-time enrolments in the last year, 60% are female, and that the rate of enrolment for full-time studies university-wide has slowed slightly in the last three year period while enrolment for part-time studies has grown dramatically by 11.9%. So, if 60% of those enrollments are female, then we are talking about an increase of female students in part-time studies.

A lot of women who have children then want to go back to educate themselves are a lot of our registration, especially single mothers, to change the opportunities in their lives. They can only do it on a part-time level, financially and hourly.

I was just wondering whether this was more a coincidental fact, that it is not really discrimination against women. It just so happens that more women are taking courses and because of the policy of full-time being more serious and the priority being given to them, then it is coincidental.

That is my point, full-time is not more serious. That is a false premise - that full-time students are more committed students than part-time students.

But in terms of the way the University finances programs, does it not have discrimination in terms of funding. Certainly.

That is what I'm saying. In terms of the way the

established norm exists now, this issue has come to the fore, primarily because of the fact that there are more women. Would that issue be the same if the numbers had been reversed.

Well, there is a discrimination against part-time people, if you close programs to part-time students. That is a discrimination. Part-time people should have equal opportunity to education. So whether it is female or male, we have discriminated against part-time students. That is quite obvious.

This is correct. But why do you call it a woman's issue?

Because we are maintaining that a woman's life-style, because of her wish to have a family as well as study, we have to leave the opportunities open for women to be able to persue both careers, education as well as domestic. We are saying that that is a particular problem for females, and that we must keep the doors open for these people.

But by labeling it a woman's issue then you are automatically saying that it is not any other kind of issue.

No, we are not saying that.

Excuse me. I just want to point out the fact that the Permanent Review Committee is here today at my request. Please feel free to include these people in the discussion.

The fact that it is a women's issue does not mean that it is not other issues. Women tend also to be a lot poorer than men. It is also an economic issue, and it is also a man's issue. It is discriminatory against workers, against poor people. But it is also a women's issue.

I agree with you 100%, but if it is categorized as a women's issue then the temptation is to only deal with it, and talk about it and try to solve it as a women's issue when it is also a lot of other kinds of issues.

That is right. We are raising it as a women's issue, and we feel that since that is the only way that many women can participate in education, then it needs to be dealt with for them but also once it is dealt with, it will solve the issue for many other people.

We would seem to have an ambiguous premise, because it is a women's issue threatening an exclusively women's issue, or it could mean A women's issue and A man's issue and a University issue. But I don't think that is what we mean. So perhaps we shouldn't talk about the premise, but about the issue of part-time students.

It was the way I could get it on the agenda.

I would like to raise another issue and get the academic

implications on the table in this way. Art Education has a program, a diploma in Art Ed., which initially was restricted to full-time people, and now accepts a certain kind of part-time arrangement. It is also coincidental that 99% of the students are female, so that is maybe related to the initial assumption. The reason for the initial restriction was that the program is an integrated program, and I think that the Art Therapy Diploma might add to that. There are certain programs in a University which are integrated, which means that these courses have a very intimate relationship with one another, that the content is shared, that what happens in one course affects the other, and that there are certain academic and educational reasons for courses to be taken concurrently. This is still true. But what we have done over the years, since 1969 when this program was initiated, was to respond to student need. We did have students who found that they had to work in order to maintain themselves. What we did was divide the program up so that it was possible to take it in two years rather than one by grouping certain courses that absolutely had to be taken together, and other courses that we felt could. What we want to emphasize is that part-time students should not be penalized in terms of quality of education. Access is one thing, but at the end they want to come out with a degree or a diploma which is a quality diploma and has standing in a community. One has to look at each program and see what those needs are. It is possible to do something in terms of grouping courses. Is it absolutely essential. I think that the blanket statement that you must be full-time in order to be committed is absolutely wrong. But there are certain requirements within each discipline or within each program which may need a certain degree of integration.

It is not a complete open door. There is still the need for the student to be able to adjust their working time to include for example an internship, so that students coming into a program know that they may start with courses that they can take in the evening, but that at one point in this program, they will have to commit themselves to a six-weeks internship in the school from 9-5, and that's it (in order to fulfill the requirements of the professor).

Just to follow on with Leah's remarks, I think there is discrimination of part-time students. Our admission packets prohibit part-time application in some programs. I've heard comments being brought up at different times during the last eight years about the commitment and dedication of part-time students, and I found the comments upsetting, because I was a part-time student for numerous years. Then I completed my education as a full-time student and I did quite well, in Psychology. I found that I was committed and I got very good grades. I also found that I wasn't alone. Personally, I found that in most of my courses, the most serious students were the part-time students. They were taking two or three courses at one time and getting through their education very well and with dedication. I have found the same thing in this Faculty with the part-time students that I have had to deal with. I find it very unfortunate that these programs are closed to

very dedicated and committed part-time students. I think that part-time students who want to do a program in Graphic Design as part-time students, will fit in the pedagogical requirements. They should be allowed to be admitted into that program and fit the rest of this program along with considerations of the department for the pedagogical viewpoint. They should be allowed to try it. Right now we are not allowing them to try it and in my point of view this is really open discrimination against part-time students. When you think about it clearly, part-time students are one of the supporting programs within the University from all points of view. First of all, the University is filled for part-time evening students originally; and secondly, the part-time student should have the right to try it at least.

I don't mean to make light of that statement by any means, but I suspect that it has been brewing now for eight years.

I would like this Faculty to make a commitment to the part-time student by addressing the issue and integrating its programs so that it responds to the needs of part-time students, and that the courses are taken concurrently that are needed to be taken, and that can be very easily done.

* Motion

(Duval, Szilasi) "All programs, presently closed, be opened to part-time students."

I would like to see the timetable be considered. Certain programs are not closed to part-time students, but not enough of the important courses are offered every so many years to allow the part-time student to get through the program. So not only should the programs be open to the part-time students but I think more attention should be paid to timetable.

* Motion

(Duval, Szilasi) "All programs presently closed, be opened to part-time students, notwithstanding the shortage of staff, and taking into consideration the timetabling of courses."

I would like to hear from other sections, closed to part-time students, other than Modern Dance.

I was always against Design being closed to part-time students. I wasn't aware that it was. In response to what Leah has said, we have the same problem in that 3-D is an integrated program, and the 200 level students really need to take three courses consecutively. On the 300 level, they also need to take three courses consecutively. One problem with part-time students is the fact that they tend to need more counselling because of yearly gap between taking one course and another course and another course. For instance, Design 200 has seven

sections. Only two of those sections are taught by full-time faculty.

Design Drawing has five sections. One section only is taught by a full-time faculty member. This does mean that ^{counseling} ~~that~~ to try and get a part-time student to see a relationship between one course and another in relation to a program, is extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Can I respond to that? No one is asking you to change your quotas. You can have the same quota but you can distribute it differently between part-time and full-time. You would be dealing with the same number of majors that you are dealing with now.

The counselling that we are talking about has to do with the people majoring in the area. Am I mistaken that you have less than 20 (15) majors in the area, and three full-time faculty members for 3-D Design.

200 are allocated for students in Graphic Design and 3-D Design. 220 Drawing is specifically for students in Graphic Design and 3-D Design. That is where the problem of counselling comes in. You have students who are coming from a common core, and will go on to do either Graphic Design or 3-D Design.

You counsel where they go and not where they come from.

If you addressing the question of advancing, it is the majors that we are talking about. Those individuals who are enrolled in your program, either part-time or full-time, that is where the advising would come in. Obviously there will be times when you will be counselling on a very minor level, with some students within your classes but many times that takes place in your class. But by virtue of the advising itself, it is the majors that we are talking about.

Are part-time faculty expected to come in over their teaching time to advise students? Because that is what would be required.

As John pointed out, you are really only dealing with less than twenty students.

Secondly, our problem is at the 200 level.

The point that is on the floor which I think resulted from Leah's statement is, that many times what we try to do is arrange a program for a part-time student, so that the student had access to the program itself. That is still keeping in mind that that student had other commitments outside the University. So this is aside from the type of activities that might take place within a Design 200 course. It is the accessibility of the part-time student to our programs and it is constructing a program for that student (part-time) that

will allow that student accessibility to the program itself. That is the issue at hand. I think you are addressing a few other issues. I understand the issues you are addressing but I think they are different types of issues than necessarily the part-time student accessibility to the university.

I am dealing with Elizabeth's question. I am sympathetic to the motion except I want some discussion from Mona and that she think about softening it a bit. It seems to me that one way of doing this would be to make a recommendation for the Curriculum Committee to do something about that because, for example, some years ago Elizabeth's argument for no part-time students majoring in Dance was the necessity of the dancer working every day. Now, her position may have changed, but at that point that was a convincing argument, and it seems to me that each area that does have a program restricted so that part-time students may not be enrolled should be asked to present their argument to the Curriculum Committee, because it is conceivable that there is an acceptable argument. I think it is safe to say that. Also looking at the calendar, it is curious because the sort of things we are talking about, the things that we encounter, are in fact (for instance, the Graphic Design restriction) is not so unreasonable sounding. The Graphic Design restriction is that a student who is finished 260 Graphic Design must complete the rest of the honours of Graphic Design program in 4 years. That sort of statement is not a nasty statement that we are thinking exists. It may also not be the way admissions is practised. There is a complex of problems which perhaps is better dealt with by the Curriculum Committee with a motion from Faculty Council urging them to do something about it.

We are beginning the admission process right now for 1985-86. The admission process begins and we will have made some decisions by certainly April. If you want a motion or recommendation like that to take it over to Faculty Council, it seems to me that we should put a time limit on it. If possible it should be done for this admission process, but for sure to be completed for next year.

I have some slight concern. I don't know the time but I know that the drafting of admission material took place much earlier, and that the admission material which might state the restrictions about programs to part-time students is already at the printers. It may be that it is too late to formulate this year.

The programs in Design are restrictive but I'm not sure if it is printed in any of the admission information. I think it is printed in the calendar. If we are proposing a change which would restrict admission, that would be another question.

I was wanting to respond to Elizabeth again in something that we have in the diploma. It says normally full-time study is recommended, and that is because of the integrated component of

the curriculum itself. We have had students do it over two years, if they are in practicum situation. They need a Psychology course with it. It makes curriculum sense. You cannot separate the two. In those cases we have let them do it over a two year span, but from student response over four years now, they themselves recommend to other students not to take the first year part-time. So, we have integrated that into our curriculum to suggest to other students normally take it full-time in the first year, making adjustments for individual needs, such as women who are pregnant or who have to take care of their children, do practicum over a longer period of time or something like that. Secondly, in the Master's level, because we have perceived the two years as complete full training, we have done it at the part-time level as well moving our thesis seminar to evenings or moving role play to evenings (that alternates between years). We have addressed the issues curriculum-wise, taking students into consideration, but also still recommend that it is done normally for curriculum reasons.

I'll try to answer Elizabeth's statement. In the first place, we went out of our way and made considerable adjustments to create a major in Theatre which was in fact accessible to part-time students. A major in Theatre does not require that students do productions in our block schedule which requires a student to take a production course that runs five days a week for four weeks. The hours are from 1:00 to 7:00 (for rehearsal), where students are required to be in the shop to do the show from 9:00 to 12:00 and from 1:00 to 6:00. It takes about 150 hours to prepare a show and it is an ensemble activity and you have got to do it together, you can't rehearse alone. So you have a particular modality of art which seems to require that groups come together and work at the same time in an integrated fashion. Quite apart from that, what we try to do is to set up a major which would allow people to get around this. To do courses in Theatre, in an individual way by associating themselves with community theatre groups like the Black Theatre Workshop or Lakeshore or some group which would give them some production experience in a partly supervised way outside our Department. There are a few people who have begun to take advantage of this, so while it is a small program, it is a crack in the armour of this type of scheduling that we find necessary for the majority of our students who have a professional career in mind. Now it is simply not possible to educate people in Theatre without doing it. I do it, or you talk about it, and you have a B.A. in drama, which is quite reasonable, and a lot of schools do it, and perhaps we ought to do it too. But I want you to understand that it is not really a Fine Arts program. It is a very different program, and if we did it, that program would be wide open to part-time students. We have considered the part-time student and we build the program, in fact, the major in Theatre to answer the needs of part-time students. We see absolutely no way however, of having professional education in Theatre, for a designer or an actor who does not come on study in such a way that they can develop the vocal instrument, the body and the imagination and do Theatre unless they do that at the same time. I think you have

to come to school in the morning, as our students do, at 8:45. They go into the studio, and they work on their body and voice until noon. They take classes in acting in the afternoon for 8 weeks. Then that afternoon program stops. They continue with the dance, the body, and the movement in the morning, and they do rehearse all afternoon, every afternoon. That is a model which allows for good professional education. We have one stage which is fully equipped and one partly equipped and really is not a theatre, and we have eleven faculty and three staff. That is our resource. Using that resource we feel that we can offer the program that we are offering now. To offer another kind of program where we would have, in addition to working all day, working all evening, we would need additional staff, additional faculty or we would have to draw from Peter to pay Paul. We couldn't offer professional education during the day and this kind of community oriented, interest-oriented kind of development which would be interesting to the part-time student. Our staff and faculty are very committed, they are always there, and I find it hard to understand how we could implement, in fact, the recommendation that all programs be open to part-time students. They would be open but, in fact, I don't think the students could take them. I think you would need some kind of enablement legislation. You would have to enable us to do it, and I'm not sure that we know how to.

There is another way. If you look at an individual who can arrange his schedule and still at the same time manage his outside commitment, if he can take that program, then I think that we should give them the opportunity to do so.

We don't throw out students who are taking 22, 21 or 17 credits. Some of our students are in fact part-time at particular times during the period of their education. Design students often are because they find that when they are designing a show, it is too heavy for them to continue to take every thing else at the same time. So they drop courses and take another year. The largest number of our design students do that, part of the time.

I would like to continue along this same line, because the situation in Film Production is, to a certain extent, similar. There is more to part-time education than commitment and motivation on the part of the student. There is a very important part of part-time education, and this is how much education can part-time students get from certain areas and certain programs. Certain areas lend themselves better to part-time education than others. I also believe that there is a difference between part-time and full-time education. Part-time courses which are better for part-time teaching, are more of a self-contained nature than full-time courses which tend to be over-lapping and working together with others. We have experiences in Film Production of students who were taking the (for the sake of example) first year, second year and third year Film Production (Film Making 1, 2, and 3). Students who were taking Film Making 1 and 2, then they were skipping one year and then coming back the year after,

it was never a very happy experience for us. So I would support what Gerry said, and my intervention is along his line, that there are certain areas which we can nominally call open to part-time students, but is it to the best advantage of some students to take those areas as part-time students. This is the question.

That is an option in the sense that it is best determined by virtue of the discipline itself but also by the individual in his readiness.

I'm not exactly sure what your point was Andre, because Film Production has always been open to part-time students. It is now and I think it should always be open to part-time students.

It is, except that part-time students who are taking Film Production and cannot take other courses because he is a part-time student, he is at a certain disadvantage, in comparison to those students who are taking those other courses. If he takes, as a part-time student, only Film Production and cannot take Film Editing or some Film Studies course, or Film Writing, or Acting and Directing for the Screen, he is taking less courses and he has less input into what he needs for a professional education.

Yes, but many students are perfectly willing to take a long time to finish their education, and to do all those courses over five or six years instead of over three years.

Try to understand, I am not against part-time students in our program.. I am only pointing out that perhaps at some stage (advising?), it should be pointed out to students that if they take a program as a part-time student, they will have less knowledge of what they need.

I don't agree with your statement. I think I have come into contact with hundreds of our students in the last three years as Chair of the Department, and I don't think that they are coming up with less knowledge.

I would like to respond to Andre's comments. He is quite right that Film Production is given in the evening, which to a part-time student, might make it accessible, and he is quite right that the other courses are not as accessible to the part-time student. That is a curriculum problem is it not. Shouldn't those courses be given at times that would make it accessible for a part-time student to take those courses.

As well, part-time students, within our faculty, are very helpful to the other full-time students, because generally speaking, a part-time student is taking Film Making, Film Production, whatever, chances are that student is working in the industry which is what we all hope to do when we get out of here. Chances are that that student has experience which might be beneficial to the other students who may not be working. So I think part-time students should be encouraged. They are not encouraged right now. They are not encouraged in Film Production

right now to be a part-time student because of curriculum and other things.

I disagree with you, and I think that I have some knowledge in this area. It starts at admissions. The admissions is completely open and our recommendations have never never discriminated against the part-time student getting into our majors or specializations or whatever. You will notice that in our evening schedules we probably offer more of our absolutely essential courses in the evening and day-time than any program in this faculty. So I think you are throwing around generalizations that don't have a basis in fact. I want to make one point which we might forget about, and that has to do with the financial implications about this decision, and whether the Curriculum Committee is the proper place to investigate the financial implications. Because if we are opening up five programs to part-time students, that obviously changes the amount of money that comes into the University for each of those students. If the new admission quotas stay the same, there is a certain amount of money for a full-time student and there is a lesser amount for a part-time student.

No, it is on the number of credits.

It is less money if you have the same number of students, because they are not taking the same number of courses, and that is a very real consideration that has to be addressed at some point. I agree with John. It is a good place to do it for the Curriculum implications, and as in Gerry's case that there may be a program where this does not work. I think you have to have a lot of investigation about the issues. But where does the financial implication get investigated?

Mario, you disagree with what I said about a part-time student taking Film Production. But it sounds to me like nonsense. If you say that part-time students taking Film Production are not at a disadvantage because they cannot take ancillary courses, why do we offer these ancillary courses at all?

I don't think he is at a disadvantage because he has an opportunity to take 18 credits in one year, and he can only take 6 credits in Film Production (as in making of films in one year), he still has 12 credits he can take in auxiliary courses. I don't see the disadvantage.

There are two points I want to make, that have already been brought up. What has happened, all through the discussions, you were not talking part-time, you were talking evening. Everyone mentioned a full-time job for people or the fact of courses in the evening. No one was talking part-time, because a person can register part-time, take 18 credits, and meet some of these requirements for these programs. So you are not discriminating against part-time people. Open them up for the four part-time people who can take the courses in the day. If they can meet the

courses when they are scheduled, fine. They are in the program and you are not discriminating. But what you are discriminating against, by not offering them in the evening, for a person with a full-time job, 9-5, that is the person you are discriminating against. Don't say you are defining it on the basis of part-time, 24 credits or less, this motion should read, discriminating against students who are unable to take courses during the day, who can only take them in the evening.

That is true because I have seen stamps on that by virtue of general students enrolled within either day or evening courses, and we have close to the highest percentage within the University, of that cross-over between students registered in either day or evening.

What Ken Adam just said is not true for me, because I am being discriminated against for wanting to take courses during the day, and I cannot do it with my schedule, even if I work full-time. It does mean I'm short courses during the day, and I want to ask Elizabeth if she could explain her reason for closing evening courses.

When I started the program, it was open to part-time and full-time people. I had no budget and I had only personal property. There was one year that I taught four half courses, so it has been a rather hard time. I spoke with Ann about the part-time students. In the beginning, being a very liberal person, and having part-time people in the program, I offered my office as a nursery, and we had babysitting on the floor, and all kinds of things for our single parents who were taking classes. A lot of them dropped out because they thought they just couldn't integrate this into their lives. Dance is a subject that has a personal saturation point that is very high. Most of my students are there from 8:30 in the morning through the whole day and on the weekends. Because my program is also very small, and because I really do not discriminate against anybody, I try to do the best job I can with no budget and no staff. Ann and I therefore decided that maybe the program should be closed to part-time students. I will disagree with some of the statements said here because some of the students have said to me, as long as they keep their technical ability going, doing choreography at the part-time level is better because they have more time to give to a slower development of this craft. I would say that after the commitment has been made, and they have proved to themselves that they are committed, the part-time study does work for the choreography student as long as technical ability is pulled along. I would be willing at this point to go to the committee and re-design my program to support part-time students involvement, even re-design the program so that they would study through their scholastic year, and the summer period, because with Dance this is also very important. So that instead of getting a concentrated scholastic year, and perhaps nothing in the summer, then there would be some kind of responsibility to keep the study going on a steady basis, if it is not at the full saturation point. Maria here, has been a part-time student of

mine. There has been another problem with Kit Griffin and the Maria. To get them to the point where they could graduate before they die with frustration, it took a great deal of counselling, a great deal of letters to the Student Request Committee, substituting one subject for another subject (something that I had found that personally suited them), I could not do this if I were not a work-a-holic, and if I had a program with more than 20 students per year. It is just impossible because I do all the counselling, and I have re-designed a program for her so she can graduate.

I think that if we need a living proof, as France pointed out earlier, that the commitment that is there in the part-time student is just as important, if not sometimes a little bit more than some of us here full-time, because you have to redesign your time for a lot of different commitments in your life, and it makes you that much more a whole person. Why can you not have that opportunity to do so? I think that is an issue that should be brought up.

I have found problems only because of the unavailability of the courses for my time slot - that is one of the major problems. But I am graduating in April.

In all of the comments made today, I always have the feeling that the commitment is there for full-time, and if there is any extra time or extra money then it will be given to the part-time. It is the attitude that really hurts the most. There is an elitist attitude pervading around, a prejudice, against the struggles of people who are trying to get their education on a less than full-time basis, and I think that is the most important commitment - I mean a change of attitude - that education is just as important. It may take longer but it is just important and valuable to people who take it in a longer period of time.

One of the first steps in terms of identifying and making visible our commitment to part-time education for individuals who wish to take on programs part-time, is to follow up in terms of your motion, as well as John's suggestion that it begin to be addressed in a very co-operative manner, that this issue of part-time open the availability of our programs, that timetabling issue as well and the third of registration, cross-scheduling and so forth, be addressed. I understand the attitude, and the attitude problem that is certainly there (I also have disagreement with that underlying belief that somehow the full-time student is somehow better and more committed). I just do not accept that whatsoever. I think to handle our commitment to the part-time student, we have to begin with the suggestions that have been made by the Permanent Review Committee and to implement these changes within our programs, and address the part-time student and availability of our programs.

In the end, the commitment does come down to money, and how we distribute or use our resources, and I agree with Mona in this regard, that there is an underlying sense that we are limited in

our resources. We are choosing -whether we say so or not- to first satisfy the needs of the full-time student. When we are looking at our curriculum and our scheduling, we must, first of all, decide, that with the limited resources we have, or even less resources (Ken is talking about reduced input because we won't be able to accommodate as many full-time students, and therefore there will actually be less money coming in). That is quite a commitment. I think people have to say, are we ready to accept these consequences? I think these consequences do not have to be as drastic. In other words, less money does not necessarily mean poorer education, because if we look at it from the curriculum point of view or the scheduling point of view, we might be able to retrieve a lot from the material. One last thing I wanted to mention was, we've been talking about integrated programs, consecutive programs only from the point of view of students being able to take courses concurrently or consecutively. There is one aspect we haven't talked about which I think is very important in an integrated program, and that is that the faculty have to be prepared to be working together, because the problem of a student not knowing what is going on in one course or having to be advised about courses, it is also a problem of faculty not communicating with each other, or knowing or seeing the program as a whole. I just want to put that other aspect that the faculty have a responsibility in an integrated program to be active. The student does not need as much advising if he goes into a course where the faculty member knows what he has done in the course before, and what the role of that course is in the total program.

There is a motion on the floor. Maybe it should be restated, clarified, or perhaps take into consideration the suggestion that was made as well.

How programs are opened up would be a problem for whatever committees are responsible for that, so I do not feel that this motion should necessarily contain that. I would like a commitment to the motion that all programs, presently closed, be open to part-time students. Now, if someone else would like to make an amendment to it about how that process could take place.. but I would like the motion left as originally stated.

"All programs, presently closed, be open to part-time students". That essentially is the motion itself.

Could I have a point of clarification? Could I ask Mona would that have application to, for example, a specialization in Films. Do you believe that program is closed?

I know that there are some programs, in particular in Theatre, in practise, the way it is set up, it is not possible to take it part-time.

But that is not the motion.

I just want to understand whether or not it has application,

because I really do not know what you mean, but it does have an interest to me. We really have to know what the motion means specifically.

This University has made a commitment to part-time studies, I don't even know how the programs happened that it is not possible to study here part-time. There was no mechanism that set that up, it just happened, and we are sitting with it. So to try to make a motion to remedy that when we don't even know how it happened, is pretty hard.

The motion is going to have to contain something about day and evening, because there is no space at night. There is no way of putting these programs on in the evening. It is going to have to read in such a way that the student who is part-time will take it as a part-time student with a part-time load, but taking it within the day sections. You cannot just leave it open and say everybody is going to admit people, because that means you are going to have to develop the program for evening students, and there is no space - absolutely none. Where are you going to put them?

Are you saying, even though this University offers part-time education, it can't give it?

Yes.

Is it possible in this program to do it as a part-time student?

Yes.

Your motion is not addressing the problem.

That is what I said in the very beginning. You are not defining part-time students.

I'm trying to re-word it. "That all programs, presently offered in the Faculty of Fine Arts, be accessible to study on a per-credit basis - that there be no limited number of credits."

Before it was discussed, I was going to vote against the motion, because it seemed to me that as Faculty Council telling Theatre they must radically change the programs that seem to be working, and I hope that is something we should do without a great deal of further discussion.

There is a way that further discussion can be encouraged. We can send it to a number of areas. On recommendation, it can be sent to the Curriculum Committee and to the Registration Committee (re: this last point on the recommendations). It could be a consideration when timetabling is made by virtue of the departments. That is another way of doing it, so that the discussion continues, rather than mandating, as John is suggesting, to any department that they have to do this. I

think, generally, by virtue of the discussion regarding the issue of part-time within this faculty, people are willing to begin to think of how we can accommodate the part-time students.

I'll delete my motion then, and recommend that this Council form a task force to look at the special problems of part-time studies and accessibility within the faculty.

Part-time students take courses in the day and evening. Full-time students take them in the day and in the evening. We cannot separate evening and day like this.

The only programs that are closed, are closed to part-time evening.

It is the admission process, if you want to pin-point it, because there are some programs that do not admit part-time students. That has to be changed.

That was the essence of my motion. It was at the admitting end of it. You can't even apply. A lot of people apply on a full-time status and then drop courses, who are essentially studying part-time, ~~if~~ that is the only way they can get in.

We have two officers from the Student Affairs Office here. I would like some clarification. There are programs that are closed to students. On the basis of admission, I would like to know what programs those are.

You absolutely have to register for 24 credits in first year in Modern Dance and in Graphic Design and I think in 3D Design.

What happens if you register for 24 credits and then drop some. The system then screws itself up. Everyone should know to do that.

That is why, if you look at the admission process, and you have no part-time students being able to apply, then you look at the statistics and you have full and part-time in the program, what they have done is that they have registered and enrolled the first week as full-time students and the next week, they simply drop down.

So, you are saying that officially, you cannot register or be admitted as a part-time student but it is O.K. if you can count a part-time student under this year's enrolment.

I need a motion of some sort to begin closure on this issue.

I propose that all programs be open at the time of admission to both full and part-time students.

... And there is no minimum quota for part-time students.

I'm not saying that. I'm just talking about admissions.

We've already been told that all kinds of things happen after they have been admitted, but it is the principle involved that we should accept. Once the student is in a program, then you try to help them fulfill their program to their advantage. But it is at the admissions point that we are not being consistent or stating a policy.

I would like to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee of Faculty Council to look at this issue, to come back to Faculty Council with some recommendations after they have gone through a process of consulting with the various members of the Faculty, Departments and Administrative Offices to somehow resolve this issue. I'd like to appoint Mona, Shirley McLeod, Mario, and Elizabeth.

I have a pet concern right across the University and that is the service towards evening students. Normally, I do not volunteer, but I would like to be involved in this committee, if you feel it is appropriate.

Fine.

Could part of this expanded committee include Theatre since Theatre is a crucial area in this sort of issue.

Everybody is crucial.

I fully expect the Ad Hoc Committee to begin consultation with the various departments on this. I don't expect them to act independently of discussions with departments whose programs are presently closed.

It is just that Theatre sounds like it is being one area which has the strongest case, for perhaps not being able to go along with what this committee might recommend.

Then the Ad Hoc Committee will investigate them.

Gerry, you have had strong feelings about this.

I think it is perfectly feasible for the Faculty to dismantle the program, and I think they might. I think they might be within their rights to do it. For the University to not have a professional program is there. I think that is feasible. Or a radical new model for professional Theatre.

The point is, as far as I can I would like to deal with this in a positive manner with input into the process. I fully expect that the Committee will test the situation in Theatre.

Is there a time period for this Committee?

Yes, there will be. My feeling is that they should report back by March.

8. Advisory Search Committee to replace University Librarian

There is an Advisory Search Committee being set up to replace Mr. Fillion as the University Librarian. We are required to place a Faculty Member on that Search Committee. I am now asking for nominations for anyone who might be interested to sit on this committee. The suggestion was made that one of the members of our Faculty on the University Library Committee might like to have input on who replaces him, possibly Gerry or Jackie.

I'll nominate Jackie.

That is a Committee that is probably going to begin sitting in January for all of next year. I suspect that they meet Monday and Wednesday nights. You have got to be available, so we can't just pull names out of a hat. You have got to have a schedule that makes you available Monday and/or Wednesday night of all next year or you can't be on the committee. My suggestion would be that Faculty Council authorize Gerry, Jackie and you to ask our Senate Library Committee members to either find or volunteer one of themselves to be the representative.

That person would have to be approved by Council.

Is that necessary? Can't we, in advance, approve your selection? If we have to do that before the end of the year, are we going to have a special meeting of Council to do that?

We can do it by mail ballot, can't we?

Or at the next meeting of Council, approve the nomination. This Committee does not sit until next September.

Do we have a meeting in January?

If there is an agenda, yes.

I think your suggestion is a good one in terms of the two Library representatives in the Faculty of Fine Arts, and by virtue of the actual appointment of that individual, we can take care of that in a number of ways. If we have the name by early in January, you will have it by mail.

I'm seeing Jackie this afternoon. I could ask her how she feels about this. I'll make her aware of the meetings being Monday and Wednesday nights as on the memo.

9. The Ronald Reagan Computer Science Literacy Course

The Ronald Reagan Computer Science Literacy courses appeared. It is being offered in second term, and 15% of the places are being held for Fine Arts students. If you see students between now and the time of registration for second

term who are interested in taking a Computer Science Literacy Course, this is the one. There are no computer pre-requisites. It is a very fundamental computer University course. It will be evaluated at the end of the next semester to see how it functions. Please advise students about this reserved space.

Do you have a number for it?

It is the inter-discipline IDSS. The topic is called inter-disciplinary studies. The capacity is 100. It will be taught on an experimental basis in a lecture and seminars of 20 people (that is my understanding). There will be some access to terminals. It is a general introductory course.

I wish I could have announced this to my advisors.

You have no idea of enrollment because people don't know it exists.

It is in the timetable.

Perhaps one could think of this for next year. If we don't fill the places, does that mean that next year we won't be getting them?

No, next year we will get 15% also.

*Motion

(Langley, Sherman) Adjournment

CARRIED